

effort. However, some of us disagree that taxpayers should have to share in the responsibility for a decision made by this Legislature to spread the load around, so to speak. We've done that before with personal property, as you all know. The net effect of that is that two hundred and some million dollars plus now is being spent by local jurisdictions in the form of property tax. So on the one hand we give an exemption, we force local jurisdictions, because for all good reasons we establish an exemption here in the Legislature that then this is just a little bit, but it's a little bit more. The state won't be sharing this responsibility. No, the state is not in the property tax business. The property taxpayers will be sharing in this responsibility. So, for that reason, I wish that we could divide the question, and I'm sorry that it appears that we're in this circumstance that we're in. I think as a result of that it is too bad the amendment wasn't written differently, and in fact the request to bring it back for a specific amendment wasn't divided before it happened. Puts a great many of us in a terrible dilemma. I think it is unfortunate that we pit the old and those who need the exemption against the rest of the property taxpayers who ultimately pick it up. And I don't think we should necessarily think this is good policy at all.

PRESIDENT: After researching the rules, it appears that the question is the motion...the amendment may be returned, and the motion is to return the bill for a specific amendment, and that precedent in the past has been that the question of returning a bill for a specific amendment shall be returned as it is. Now, after it is brought back, then if Senator Miller should challenge that this ruling is wrong, then the procedure would be that the bill could be sent back and changed at that time. But when a motion is made to return the bill it should be returned. Then if it is not divisible, then that should be brought back again and amendments changed so that it is divisible and a section at a time be brought back. Now, would...So, what I'm saying is that I've changed my mind and the amendment is not divisible now. Senator Miller may challenge that portion, if he so chooses.

SENATOR MILLER: Well, point of clarification. Does that mean that now that point can be the...the specific amendment can be split after it is returned?

PRESIDENT: No, that does not mean that. What it does mean is that if you wish to split the situation and put up two different